UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Saving the Anglo-Saxon

By SYDNEY STRONG

India and the Press

By REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

Victory in India

By RICHARD B. GREGG

France Plays Her Cards

By KARL POLANYI

VOLUME CVIII NUMBER 23

Chicago, February 22, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. EDNA R. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 363
Saving the Anglo-Saxon—SYDNEY STRONG 366
Jottings—J. H. H. 367

ARTICLES—
India and the Press—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 368
Victory in India—RICHARD B. GREGG 369
France Plays Her Cards—KARL POLANYI 371

POETRY—
Ballad of the Brave Captain—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 363
For Peace in Manchuria—LUCIA TRENT 367
Great Common Man—MARGARET LATHROP LAW 367

THE STUDY TABLE—
History by an Historic Figure—1. TARAKNATH DAS 373

CORRESPONDENCE—
C. M. T. C.—TUCKER P. SMITH 375
The Aggressor in War—JOHN T. RICKETT 375
Buying Loyalty—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 375

THE FIELD—
Report of Conference of National Federation of Religious Liberals 362
Frederick Starr Comes East 376

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

National Federation of Religious Liberals

Report of Conference Held at Joliet, Illinois

The proposed union of the Universalist and Unitarian churches was the subject of addresses by Dr. Sidney B. Snow of Meadville Theological School and Judge Roger S. Galer, prominent Universalist layman and president of the National Federation of Religious Liberals, of Mt. Pleasant, Iowa, at the conference of the Federation held at St. John's Universalist Church, Joliet, Illinois, February 2 and 3. The topic is one of vital interest to members of both denominations and the religious world.

As Judge Galer was unable to attend the conference his able address was read by the host to the conference, Dr. Walter H. Macpherson. Judge Galer stressed the importance of the action of the two bodies in appointing committees to consider the proposed merger of the two denominations. Although the map of the religious world has altered mightily in these recent years, the two bodies have long traveled almost parallel roads. Both were rebels against an austere and cruel theology and yet, in coming together, what, asks Judge Galer, should be the guiding purpose and method of the new union? A broad definition of liberalism, what it offers, the need for organization, and the advantages of union were all presented. "If the momentum of physical bodies increases as the square of the velocity, religious momentum ought to be multiplied in like manner by the joining of our forces. . . . Far more, however, would it enable us to present a united front in the social and religious conflicts that exist around us on every side." To achieve this high ideal of union, he said, there must be no suspicion on either side and any commitments that may come "must recognize the sacredness of conscience, the preservation of every property right, a scrupulous respect for differing tastes in modes of worship, and of different theological beliefs."

Dr. Snow presented the background of each denomination and stressed the fact that the two had developed as a result of the same social and religious reactions. Both groups, he said, have produced outstanding leaders in humanitarian movements and have always considered the social frontier of the church of great importance. Dr. Snow concisely pointed out the duty of the laymen of the two denominations. It is the layman who is in a position to effect this union because of his wide outlook and appreciation for its ultimate benefits. The leaders of the two groups are inclined to overemphasize the importance of the legal and doctrinal difficulties that would be involved in this consolidation, and it is the layman who must cut through these to perfect the ideal union. Above

(*Continued on page* 375)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CVIII MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1932 Number 23

BALLAD OF THE BRAVE CAPTAIN

Upon the hard highway
Where I did walk alone
I met a Brave Captain
Methought that I had known:
Wounded he was and weary,
Yet made he no moan.

"What is your quarrel, Captain,
And who hath done you wrong?
For they shall suffer in their pride
Who war against the Strong."
"They war against themselves," he said,
"And they have suffered long."

"Who are your foes, Captain,
For whosoe'er they be
Black wrath hath mingled with my blood
This piteous thing to see."

"Then you are of their fellowship,
And not of mine," said he.

"Where are your comrades, Captain,
Who plighted troth with you:
Of all that brave army
Here are left but few."
"They turned again homeward."
(He looked me through and through).

"Captain, what are these thorns,
What is this cross you bear?"
"This is my standard, brother,
And this the crown I wear;
We storm the heights at Calvary . . .

Will you be with me there?"

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

The time has long since passed when anything new can be said about George Washington (1732-1932). In recent years, the methods of modern biography have been used to humanize the august figure of the great Virginian, but after all this well-intentioned effort, he remains today what he was in his own life-time, a figure aloof and therefore remote. It is no accident that he stands apart from other men in the sacred traditions of history, for he stood apart in just this way when he was here in the flesh. His selection as commander-in-chief of the American army when independence was being fought for on the battlefield, was inevitably followed by his selection as president of the Constitutional Convention when independence rested in the council chamber, and this in turn by his selection as first president of the United States when independence was won in "a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." From the beginning Washington stood in the forefront of the nation's life, and is described by the English historian, John Richard Green, as "the noblest figure who ever stood in the forefront of (any) nation's life." His ascendancy sprang not from any supreme military genius—he was no such soldier as Marlborough or Napoleon, and perhaps was excelled by his own subordinate, Nathaniel Greene. Nor was he the greatest of statesmen—Franklin in one direction and Hamilton in another were easily his superiors. In creative thought and the sure instinct of democracy he was outshone by Jefferson. What ranked him first in his own age, and great among the greatest of history, was that most priceless of all possessions—*character*. George Washington was noble—noble in qualities of patience, courage, integrity, steadfastness of mind, purity of heart, elevation of soul. He was pre-eminently a moral personality, and therefore chief among abler men of lesser virtue. Few among the unquestioned leaders of mankind are more fittingly entitled to the supreme encomium of "hero." It should strengthen and exalt the soul of America in a tragic age to recall the memory of this man who must forever and securely remain "first in the hearts of his countrymen."

It is beginning to appear that in "Al" Smith the Democratic Party has found another William Jennings Bryan. By this we mean a man who can't be elected president, and yet insists either upon being nominated himself, or upon dictating the nomination of some other man. It might have been thought that the "Brown Derby" candidate would have taken the hint passed out to him at the last election, when he was given the most terrible drubbing ever administered to an aspirant to the White House. If anything was made plain in 1928, it was that "Al" Smith

could never be elected president of the United States. This same thing was made evident to Mr. Bryan in the comparatively early days of his career. But the Nebraskan insisted upon running year after year, and now the New Yorker is apparently preparing to enter upon the same kind of career. Bryan's blindness and selfishness doomed the Democratic Party to defeat for a generation, and now the same qualities in "Al" Smith seem about to doom the Party to another similar period of exile. The result for the Democrats this fall is of course perfectly disastrous. Only one thing, apparently, could save President Hoover in the forthcoming election, and that was the intrusion of "Al." And, lo and behold, "Al" has obligingly thrown his hat into the ring, and Republican victory, under conditions that would have seemed to be impossible, seems now assured. It is probably true, after all, that Providence is on the side of the Republican Party. At any rate, was there ever such luck, or divine favor, for the G. O. P. as an "Al" Smith to follow immediately upon the passing of a Bryan!

The Shanghai problem is evidently going to be settled—may indeed be settled before this note is printed. The Japanese ships and men will withdraw, the world will acclaim a great victory for peace in general and the League of Nations in particular—and Manchuria, quite forgotten, will be joined to Korea as a part of the Mikado's empire! Is it not precisely this result, accomplished in precisely this way, which took Japan to Shanghai in the beginning? Of course, the excuse alleged was the Chinese boycott; then the familiar bogey of Communism became a reason for attack; lastly, the Chinese were actually guilty of the incredible offense of defending their own soil from foreign invasion, and thus had to be punished—not only troops, but non-combatant men, women and children. But all this, we are convinced, was just a smoke-screen to hide what had been attempted and accomplished in Manchuria. What the Japanese wanted from the beginning was to possess this large and fertile territory. What easier thing than to seize Shanghai, under any convenient pretext, and use this city to pay China and the world for this precious loot? It's like stealing an automobile, and then breaking into the owner's house and stealing money to pay him for his machine. And the worst of it is that the world will be satisfied. Stimson and his English and French associates will talk about a great diplomatic victory, and people generally will actually be deceived into thinking that peace has been vindicated. What a farce! The hard, cold fact is that Japan went on a freebooting expedition, wantonly defied the conscience of mankind, broke every treaty-pledge and laughed at every peace appeal, made war of the most horribly brutal description, and now is walking away with all the loot she sought. We still have the League, the Court, the Briand-Kellogg Pact, but they have been terribly maimed. Our duty now is to recognize this fact, and then see what can be done to restore and revitalize these agencies of peace.

M. Tardieu thinks the way to do the above is to create an international army, or police. He argued for this strenuously in his speech for France at the Disarmament Conference. But how much does this mean in the face of a situation like that in Manchuria? Suppose that last November the League had had in its control an international armed force! What chance is there that it would have been used against Japan? If the League could not, or would not, resort to the remedies already at its disposal under the terms of the Covenant, why should we imagine that it would have resorted to this much more drastic action? And what would such action by an international army or police really be but *war*—the substitution of a universal war all over the globe for the local war in the Manchurian terrain? The gist of M. Tardieu's proposal is that we should get rid of national wars and in the future have only international wars—that is, make sure that every war henceforth is a World War on the 1914 scale! Obviously this is madness. Our one hope, of course, is that first pointed out by Mr. S. O. Levinson, and now embodied in the Briand-Kellogg Treaty—namely, to outlaw war entirely. Not to go back but to *go ahead,* is what is exacted by this latest crisis. Alert, as always, to this need, Mr. Levinson has published in the *Christian Century* (February 3rd) an article, "Disarmament, Manchuria, and the Pact." In this article he outlines the new policies which must now be adopted by the nations "in view of the obvious needs disclosed by the world situation." Central among these is the adoption "as international law by the nations assembled in Geneva" of this provision:

> *All exactions, territorial acquisitions or rights obtained by occupation or seizure by war, or under the menace of war, or in the presence of armed force, are null and void under the Pact of Paris.*

This is reliance upon law, our only hope. As applied to Manchuria, it would make the spoils of that expedition "null and void" before the expedition started. It is along this line—the forging of the bonds of peace—that the world can alone hope to be saved.

Four hundred Protestant ministers of Ohio met in conference a few weeks ago, and resolved some sentiments about war. They said:

> We are convinced that war is un-Christian, futile, and suicidal, and we renounce completely the whole war system.

We will never again sanction or participate in any war. We will not use our pulpits or classrooms as recruiting stations. We set ourselves to educate and lead youth in the principles and practice of good-will, justice, understanding, brotherhood, and peace. We will not give our financial or moral support to any war.

These ministers then went on, and said again:

Governments which ignore the Christian conscience of men in time of peace cannot justly claim the lives of men in time of war. We deplore making military service against conscience a test of citizenship, as in the Macintosh case, and military training a requirement in education, as in our land-grant colleges. . . . Therefore be it resolved that we . . . solemnly refuse to acknowledge the obligation which the Supreme Court declares to be binding upon its citizens. . . . We will use whatever influence is within our power, in our personal relations or in public address, to inform others and to awaken them to the peril in which this decision involves their traditional and most fundamental liberty.

It is not to be thought that all Christian clergymen in Ohio, or in the country at large, are pacifists of this absolutist type. These particular resolutions were voted only after long debate, and represented fundamentally the thought and idealism of younger men. But the significance of this action is none the less enormous. We have only to ask ourselves if anything of the sort could have been possible a generation or even a decade ago, to realize that we have entered upon a new attitude toward war. We are coming at last to the point in this fight which was reached at a certain notable moment in the fight against slavery before the Civil War. The victory in that case was won when there began to develop the movement of those who took the absolutist attitude toward slavery as a moral evil. It was not this aspect of slavery, or that abuse, or the other abomination, which stirred opposition, but slavery itself as an institution, a system, a horror. We are now getting this perspective on war. We used to object only to certain of the particular barbarisms of war, and to try to get rid of these at Hague conferences and disarmament meetings. But today the attack is directed against *war* "as an instrument of national policy." We have stopped lopping off branches, and are now undertaking to lay the axe at the root of the tree. This we count as the beginning of the end. War must go!

Extraordinary proposals are coming along these days for the solution of the Arab-Jewish problem in Palestine. Here is the ingenious and ingenuous suggestion of Abbas Hilmi, former Khedive of Egypt, put forward, we are told, in cooperation with Indian Moslem leaders, that Palestine be divided into two states, one Arab and one Jewish, each strictly autonomous. Just the kind of program that the southern secessionists tried to put over on this country in 1861! It would be interesting, by the way, to see just how the land would be divided between the two groups. The shoe-string Congressional districts here in America, created by our partisan gerrymandering proclivities, would be nothing to the winding tortuosities of this scheme for dividing the two native populations in the Holy Land into separate divisions. Or do the Moslem reformers propose to lift existing communities from the soil and put all Jews to the north and all Arabs to the south, or vice-versa? Not so bad, perhaps, for the Arab nomads, but hard luck for the members of both races firmly planted in cities and on farms! Equally preposterous is the recommendation foreshadowed from the report of Lewis French, Palestine Land Commissioner, soon to be published in London. This Englishman professes to see the Jewish influx into Palestine as a grave menace to the Arabs. To what Arabs—the *fellaheen* on the land, to whom the Jews have been veritable emancipators, or the landlords in Jerusalem and Cairo, who have long been fearing the loss of their serfs and the income they produce? To prevent this menace, Mr. French would still further curtail Jewish immigration, and forbid land purchase by Jews. He justifies such drastic measures on the plea that the land in Palestine available for cultivation is very small in area. Which sounds well, until one sees the miracles of restoration which the Zionists have wrought on hundreds of dunams which were sold to them only because their owners regarded them as so much waste! What the Jewish pioneers have done is to fulfil the word of the prophet about the desert being made to blossom like the rose. And in defiance of this, the British Commissioner would shut off the Jews from their homeland. Here is new evidence that all the troubles in Palestine come from meddlers at the top. At the bottom, down where people work, Jews and Arabs are slowly but surely knitting themselves into the texture of a common life. Leave them alone!

It is with a very peculiar sense of pride of possession that UNITY joins the many friends, the world around, who celebrated on February 11th last the ninetieth birthday of JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND. Dr. Sunderland was one of the group of pioneer souls who founded this journal more than a half-century ago. Today, in the tenth decade of his years, he continues in full vigor of mind and body as one of our Editorial Contributors. A brave preacher of radical Christianity, a scholar of learning and integrity, an author of standard works in various fields, Dr. Sunderland has adorned two generations. His chief fame, as his noblest service, must ever be found in India, whose independence he was the first to proclaim to our western world. We hail Dr. Sunderland as a prophet, cleave to him as a friend and comrade, and pray that we may survive to commemorate his one hundredth anniversary.

Saving the Anglo-Saxon

I am writing this editorial on my birthday. If the "Bremen" is on time, this will get to UNITY for the issue of February 22nd, Washington's birthday. I have been today attending the meeting of the Council of the League of Nations, hearing the debate between Japan and China, which has reminded me of the terrible part played by the Anglo-Saxon in the exploitation of mankind. I am asking, what can be done for saving the world from this terrible Anglo-Saxon —and from himself. For, whatever blame may be attached to Japan, he can point to the long record of aggression on the part of the Anglo-Saxon.

When I say Anglo-Saxon, I mean Americans and British alike. And, I have a right to speak of both—of Anglo-Saxon stock for centuries, a Puritan of the Puritans, baptized a Congregationalist. If any boast, I even more. And, as I sat in the Glass house, in Geneva, there swept over me a flood of recollection of the ruthless record of my people! A prayer went up for the salvation of my people—American and British.

They have a bad record. (I am not unmindful of the glorious features of Anglo-Saxon character. These I have known from my youth up—laws, freedom, faith in God.) The Anglo-Saxon has gone east and west, north and south; from pole to pole has he taken and claimed and held, until now he possesses a large part of land and water, and has his eye on being "king of the air." While he has carried the Ten Commandments and a gospel of love, his final appeal for possession has been the sword. He was the chief aggressor in capturing black Africans and enslaving them in foreign lands, while able to quote scripture for his evil deeds. He—the Yankee branch—swept across the American continent, taking away from the inhabitants all the lands, wrenching from Mexico a fourth of her territory, seizing Panama, sweeping over the Pacific, gathering in the Hawaiian and Philippine islands—and, again the sword was ever the final appeal.

The English branch of Anglo-Saxondom has encircled the globe in his exploits. A century ago, a member of this branch (knighted for distinguished service), author of several hymns, like "God is love, God is mercy" and "In the cross of Christ, I glory," was leader in the Opium War that compulsorily gave the Chinese opium and took away concessions and the strategic island of Hong Kong, and began the exploitation of a civilized people, which just now Japan is continuing. When I saw the representatives of Japan and China—what a pitiful sight—laying their case before the Council and discussing the invasion of Manchuria, I could not *hear* them, for between them I *saw* the bulky form of Robert Cecil (good man), successor of John Bowring—hymn writer and robber of China. Japan had the right to reach over and shake hands with Britain, in sin's fellowship. So, all the way from Greenland's icy mountains to India's coral strand, the Anglo-Saxon has gone, seen, divided and conquered, and held by the might of the sword. Even the sacred shrines of Christianity, Judaism and the Moslem—in Palestine—are now protected by the Anglo-Saxon sword. The two main doors of the seas—Suez and Panama—are opened and locked by Anglo-Saxon keys, and, yet, he insists on the "open door" policy, in Asia. And, in all this, his final argument is the flaming sword—the same used by Herod, in his massacre of the children.

When I think of the Anglo-Saxon—my people—I tremble. His bad record makes me afraid, afraid for the world, afraid for the Anglo-Saxon. What can be done for his salvation? to save this clever, long-headed exploiter and aggressor, who, like Mahomet, has lifted the sword for his final argument—this pioneer in the art of exploitation. I offer two suggestions. Of course, he must repent—this Jacob, "supplanter," of modern centuries! His hands are full of blood. Here are two suggestions:

1. *He must disarm.* He must practice a new technique of defense, a new art of progress. He must put up the sword and turn it into plowshares. He actually must do this, or he will go on destroying, and in the end be destroyed. This is fact, not fancy. Plain before his eyes, he could learn the way of life from Gandhi. But, the Anglo-Saxon appears to be too proud to learn from Gandhi, who is sent of God to show him the way of life.

But, let him turn to his own scriptures, where he can read that the Almighty God, maker of heaven and earth, is love, that the whole law of life is summed up in, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, and Perfect love casteth out fear, Overcome evil with good. Beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in what he possesseth, Resist not the evil man, Love your enemy, and Go and sell all thou hast and give to those who have not! This is not Gandhi. It is Christendom's own Jesus, preaching the gospel of life, and adding that whoever takes the sword shall perish with the sword. If the Anglo-Saxon doesn't like Gandhi, then let him turn to his own Savior and live.

The Anglo-Saxon must put up his sword, absolutely, or he will perish. He must put it up in individual cases, and as nations. He must learn to get on with his neighbor, absolutely without the sword; nay, can get on much better. There is abundant proof already in the world that it can be done. Not by might, not by riches, not by prestige—but by justice and mercy and non-violence can the way of life be found.

2. There is a second thing that the Anglo-Saxon must do to be saved. He must restore ill-gotten lands and properties. He must divide up ill-gotten dividends.

This will try his soul. He fairly hates the idea of restoring "concessions" wrested from China, or islands to those who have had them since the era of Moses. You touch him in a nervous spot, when you touch upon the rights of property. As long as he holds to the "sacred rights of property" he cannot be saved! The Anglo-Saxon has been practicing for so many years the ways of acquisition—of getting—that if he does not soon begin to practice distribution—giving out—he will die of congestion of brain and heart and nerves. Sure!

The sooner the Anglo-Saxon faces this situation —the better for him, and for the world, and he must act soon! He seems to be chiefly concerned still about getting more mines, more lands, holding his "mandates" which were handed him by the evil God Mars, not by the God of Christ. The Anglo-Saxon is in the position of the rich fool, who built and stuffed his barns to overflowing—he was just a plain fool, when the day of judgment came round suddenly, as today. The League of Nations might do a bit of constructive work, if it began to project a scheme of distribution of those things of which the victors robbed the defeated; also, a scheme re-alloting the territory of the earth on the principles of equality and need. I wonder, if the Anglo-Saxon in England and America would organize propaganda to push it through? What would the archbishops have to say about it?

Yet, this is the road to salvation, for the Anglo-Saxon. No doubt of it. Suppose, some fine morning, President Hoover and Premier MacDonald, after another "Rapidan" conversation, should issue a call to all the Anglo-Saxon commonwealths, to meet in conference, for the definite purpose of doing two things (1) opening up to the multitudes of Asia the waste lands of Alaska, Canada, U. S. A., Australia, which they would make to blossom as the rose! (2) to consider the best social schemes for equalization of the distribution of the products of industry, within each national group, so that the dangerous gulf between the rich and poor might be filled. This is just a suggestion of things to do in the project of restoration.

He will have to do this some century. If he does it now, voluntarily, mankind will have their faith in man and God increased—and the Anglo-Saxon will save his soul and bless the earth. If he is compelled to do it from stern economic necessity, his path will be strewn with wrecks and strife—and, in the finish, he will go down dragging half of the world after him.

So, I am praying the unselfish prayer, that my people may be saved.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Jottings

One of the delegates to the Disarmament Conference is ill, according to newspaper despatches. How is it possible that they are not all ill?

We confess that we have "a tired feeling" when we think of what lies before us in the presidential campaign this summer. The battle between the two old parties will be exceptionally bitter, but will involve no issue, and promise no progress. Think of the money, the time, the energy which will be spent, to no end at all!

We saw some fresh eggs for sale the other day, and on the package read the slogan, "Laid by Happy Hens." Query: what is a happy hen?

When a Pullman sleeping-car is named "Wilbur Wright," isn't somebody trying to steal somebody else's thunder?

Governor Rolfe, of California, in speaking recently on the radio, endorsed Lucky Strike cigarettes. We hope that the manufacturers will give him some packages to send to Mooney and Billings.

DEFINITIONS. (1) *Peace*: war in a state of suspended animation. J. H. H.

For Peace in Manchuria

The brute in man has quit his lair.
Once more there's murder down the air!

Shall we who boast a *human* skull
Again renounce the miracle
Of peace and love? Look how we gloat
And clutch our fellows by the throat!

We trumpet over seven seas
Our shimmering hypocrisies.

Must dreams of centuries be checked
Because we failed to stand erect?
Oh, let the brute be whipped to his den.
We stand to keep the peace like men!

LUCIA TRENT

Great Common Man

With simple men of Galilee
Upon the tranquil Sabbath sea,
He found unmitigated calm,
Why offer liturgy and psalm?
He chose to ride a humble ass,
Why wall him with pictorial glass?
Alone he walked with earthy feet
Through fields of freshly garnered wheat,
Why prison him beneath a spire
And train ecclesiasts for hire?
He asks no cruel sacrifice,
And wants no incense breathing spice.
Christ demands our common fare,
He welcomes children's fumbled prayer.

MARGARET LATHROP LAW.

India and the Press

[From our Special Correspondent]

"Babu journalism" is a phrase that I shall always connect with the voyage to India. Though the purpose of that voyage was known only darkly, even to myself, the instinct of the Ruling Caste on board told it that there was something definitely wrong with me. Had I not been seen reading Gandhi's paper, *Young India?* Forthwith they undertook my education. . . .

The chief crime of the *Babu* is, of course, the color of his skin. The second is in the nature of a dilemma, for if the *Babu* wears no trousers he is clearly indecent, whereas if he adopts Western dress, the slavishness of his mentality is apparent. . . . The third and fourth count do not bear repetition. But the fifth is undoubtedly his despicable inability to master our language, and speak it like one of God's Englishmen. It is indeed the hall-mark of inferiority.

So Babu English has acquired that antiquity and social standing as a joke that culminates in its admission to *Punch,* where it has long resided. Pensioned colonels living on the South Coast forget their livers as they feast upon its memory. It is difficult to find the exact psychological basis for this peculiar pleasure, but I suppose that, in default of other excuses for self-congratulation, a Colonel might feel as proud of his proficiency in his own language (compared with that of the *Babu*) as you or I might feel in having acquired a foreign tongue.

Strangely enough, though I saw a good deal of this *Babu* English, and some of it amusing enough, I have a much better memory and record of the achievements of "our own" press. Not that I suspect either the reader or myself of really owning anything so dangerous as a newspaper, but by "our own," of course, I mean that section of the press that ministers to our own needs and those of our fellow-countrymen in India.

There was, for instance, the *Statesman,* that august and Olympian organ of British opinion in Calcutta. The Congress resolutions of Christmas, 1929, so astonished a leader-writer on this paper that he completely lost his sense of geography, and with appropriate Vesuvian smoke and thunder, declared in one brilliant peroration that "Mr. Gandhi has been piling Pelion upon Ossa in a series of Himalayan blunders."

But by far the best examples, both of imaginative speculation and the use of the English language, came from the home front. The Rothermere organs probably win on points. Among the leaders in the *Evening News* (June 6th, 1930) I would commend especially the poetic flight in which the Government of the time was censured for its inadequate measures against "the agents of Moscow" (i. e., Mr. Gandhi and the National Congress) and its failure "to convince the tribesmen that the British are very definitely the masters of India and intend to stay there and govern it *with a hand that is as firm as it is just and wise.*" (My italics.)

Sir Percival Phillips, the *Daily Mail* Special Correspondent, has specialized mostly in a sort of penetrating psychological study of Indian politicians. If his facts are few and inaccurate, he can at least tell you the inner motive of anything that happens, and unveil the "Hidden Hand" behind even the most apparently harmless phenomena. He it was who (in his description of Gandhi's departure from India) observed the Mahatma's "propaganda laugh, to be duly recorded in the Nationalist papers."

Letters to the Press are not strictly eligible in this competition, but I cannot forbear from quoting one that appeared in the *News Chronicle,* for the 21st of November, 1930, because I am to this day puzzled as to whether its irony was intentional or accidental. The writer was pleased to read that Jack Hobbs (then in India) refused to play cricket on Sundays, and commented that "by this act the Indian people will see that it is possible for an Englishman to live up to his beliefs. . . ."

Beaverbrook specializes in the picturesque and sensational. The *Express* representative in the early months of 1930 was an imaginative Canadian, whose published "interviews" were quite creditable works of fiction. I discovered this in the first place by reading an "interview" with myself, of which possibly one-third was historical. On one occasion he arrived in a car to interview Mr. Gandhi, but improved on the event by describing his arrival in a donkey cart. As no such vehicle exists in Ahmedabad there was some speculation among us as to who officiated between the shafts.

Beaverbrook's masterpiece, however, was the *Sunday Express* of February 8th, 1930. A half-page photograph appeared on the back, under the title, "Street Rioting in India." The photograph showed a crowd of white-capped Indians seated on the ground, while the police assailed them with their batons. Underneath were the words, "The police arrive, and deal swiftly with the rioters who are seated on the ground. . . ."

A recent issue of the *Daily Express* (January 16th, 1932) affords two instances of definition. One is the connotation of a "smash-up," and runs as follows: "The Viceroy's firm action has completely changed the political aspect and smashed up all but the extremist elements, *but the boycott is 95 per cent effective,* and is causing immense difficulties to British trade." (My italics.) The other is an illuminating definition of "molestation" that follows the alarming statement, "There have been cases of European women being actually molested." This frightful crime apparently means "making a gesture, or saying 'Don't buy British.' A gesture consists of joining the hands together in a prayer-like attitude." "Molestation" is a new description of prayer that I would commend to the attention of modernist theologians.

First prize, however, both for imaginative ingenuity and masterly English, must be given to "Nelsonian," who writes long and informative articles in the *Nelson Leader.* As an Englishman and a Lancastrian he evidently realizes the vital necessity of finally ending the appalling drain of cotton goods from this country to India. At any rate he is clearly determined to leave no stone unturned in a heroic effort to perpetuate the enmity of our Indian customers. In the issue of January 8th "Nelsonian" devotes a whole column to the activities of the National Congress, although (as he explains) it only represents .003 of the population,

and so is quite a negligible quantity. However, as its policy is "nothing more nor less than Bolshevism in its extreme form" it "calls for suppression with an iron hand."

As to "Ghandi," as "Nelsonian" calls the Indian leader, his horrid doings shall be described in Nelsonian's own language as an object lesson in Babu iniquity and Nelsonian English:

> The methods adopted by the Congress party in stirring up strife amongst the working classes is diabolical in construction. The modus operandi is for several of its followers to mix amongst the workers, offering sweetmeats so dearly loved and desired by the people they are casting their eyes on to do their dirty work. Contained in these sweetmeats are drugs not noticeable to the taste, the action of which raises the frenzy of the men, who under the hypnotic spell set up, are ready for any dirty work these followers take care to inculcate in a few of the men's minds whom they have chosen as leaders. From such sources and by such measures the Peshawar and Sholapur atrocities were brought about, by the use of methods herein described. The resultant effect is that the poor workers are left to suffer, whilst the instigators clear out to newer pastures, to again commence to reach workers' hearts by again giving pure sweetmeats until the time is again ripe for their devilish work to be begun.

I don't think I can cap that. There is probably only one person who could, and that is Mr. Heath Robinson, who might easily be imagined as illustrating a scheme for defeating the Government by giving boiled sweets to the children of electors. As for the necessary ordinance against sweetmeats, Jix alone could devise it, and I will not anticipate him.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.
Lewes, Sussex, England.

Victory in India

[From a Private Letter dated January 20, 1932.]

There is one similarity between the Indian situation and the American Revolution which has apparently not been commented on. During the American Revolution France was at war with England, and French opposition was a large factor in the result. It is now recognized that at present France is engaged in a financial war with England as well as with Germany. It is quite possible that before the Indian struggle is over, this French opposition to England will weaken England's power against India and help toward the Indian victory. The forecasts about action at Lausanne indicate that the French opposition will be free to operate until next autumn, anyhow.

Taking it all together, the present situation seems distinctly favorable to the cause of the Indian Congress party. This is apparent when you compare the situation with that which existed in the spring of 1930. At that time the Congress had neither the unity, nor the determination, nor the experience in struggle that it has at present. Then there had been no great demonstration of the effectiveness of non-violent resistance. Then the masses had not felt their power. Then the peasants were not feeling the pinch of the fall in prices as they are now. Then there had been no movement among the women. Then there was no strong organization of "Red Shirts" among the Pathans of the Northwest. Now, there are between 100,000 and 200,000 Moslem "Red Shirts" in the N. W. Frontier, all pro-Congress and all vowed to non-violence. Now, at the very start there are no-tax movements in one or more districts in Bengal, in at least three districts of the United Provinces involving there upwards of 100,000 peasants, as well as in several districts of Bombay Presidency. So that is a big advance over the 1930 beginning.

In the present situation there are numerous factors in favor of the Congress and detrimental to British power. Gandhi's visit to London taught the British ruling class how strong he is against all the weapons in their arsenal—fear, ridicule, flattery, and temptations to share in the loot. He made many personal friends among the really fine Englishmen, some of them in positions of influence, such as journalists, Labor Party leaders, bishops, reformers of various sorts. He proved to them and to the world his courage, patience, balance, reliability and reasonableness. All this makes the foundation for a future opposition to the Government policy, after Indian sufferings have shamed decent British people sufficiently. World opinion is more in favor of Gandhi and the Indian Congress as a result of his visit to London. His offers to Lancashire laid the basis for a subsequent struggle between British manufacturing and commercial interests on the one hand and British army and financial interests on the other, after India proves that she cannot be cowed into submission. British trade interests will then favor yielding up control over Indian political life in the hope of regaining even a small portion of their former trade by competition in a free market, but British army and finance will try to hold on. So the field is set for a subsequent break-up of British unity and morale. The first cracks in this morale were shown by Lansbury's cable to the Viceroy protesting against his refusal to see Gandhi, and Lansbury's subsequent remarks about the difficulty and necessity of Britain now gaining Indian trust. Perhaps the prayers suggested by the bishops about forgiveness for national arrogance and domineering may indicate another crack in morale. Another is an editorial and a strong article by G. T. Garrett in the *New Statesman* and *Atheneum* for January 2, vigorously criticising the Government for its Indian policy and actions. Of course, as soon as the strength of India and the real danger of her loss to Britain grows clearer, these cracks will harden over and for a time all Britain will seem to be solidly approving the Government. But that will not last long, and then when morale begins to loosen again it will split rapidly.

In India the followers of the Congress have had over a year and a half of severe discipline and practice in non-violent resistance, both before and since the Delhi truce. Many training schools for men and for women volunteers were established and have been busy. Napoleon said that discipline is 75 per cent of the effectiveness of an army. The peasants have waked up enormously and are being reached by Congress volunteers far more widely and effectively than formerly. All groups within the Congress are firmly convinced of the superior effectiveness of non-violent resistance. The re-starting of civil disobedience has opened a large channel again for the energies of men and women who during the months of the truce felt

that violence was their only relief. I doubt that even the violent revolutionaries, who are not Congress members, will do much violence now. While there will be some instances of individuals and crowds being goaded by police or military rough stuff into losing their self-control and doing violent retaliation, these instances will, I believe, be relatively few and small. That is because of the discipline. They will do better than in 1930. The newspapers and all government official reports will of course allege that crowds threw stones or "rioted," but those allegations will, I believe, be no more true than were the German "atrocities" in Belgium in 1914-19.

The severity of the Viceregal Ordinances and the arrests may seem at first to be a very powerful weapon in the hands of the Government. But really this repression is a boomerang. Also it will operate to put Congress activities underground, rather than to stop them. It has already had results distinctly adverse to the Government. It immediately split the citadel of Moslem opposition to the Congress—the All-India Moslem League—causing the resignation of its president and secretary. According to the London *Times,* a very strong pro-Congress movement had developed in that Moslem group while its leaders were in London. As the "Red Shirts" around Peshawar are all Moslems, the repression of them by Government, on top of the Government arrests of crowds of Moslems in the Kashmir troubles of early autumn, tends to turn many other Moslems against the Government. So this greatly weakens a support upon which Government has heavily relied. A telegram of protest to the Viceroy was sent by an association composed mostly of young English business men in Bombay, and a few days later the Governor of Bombay Presidency summoned 100 of these young English men of Bombay and talked to them for over an hour and "appealed" for their support. Evidently their criticisms against the Government had been strong. (You of course know most of these incidents, but I am assembling them thus in order to get a better picture.) The Liberal Association of Western India (full of Round Table Conference supporters) appealed and protested to the Viceroy against these measures. Sapru seems to have been the only Indian delegate to the Round Table Conference who has been quoted as publicly approving of the Government's oppressive ordinances. Hundreds of Bombay merchants have taken an oath not to buy British goods. They took no such oath in 1930. The boycott seems to have become drastic from the start. The large arrivals of Indian gold in London, as reported in the press, left Indian shores before the boycott started. I think future shipments of Indian gold, at least on private account, will be considerably smaller.

So the harsh repression of the Government has greatly weakened its support among the Moslems, the Indian Moderates and the Indian business men. According to that British quarterly, "The Round Table," edited by Lord Lothian, now under-secretary of State for India, and a member of one of the R. T. C. Committees now on their way to India, the Indian middle class are resentful because of increases in taxation, and even the landlords are sore at the Government because it scaled down slightly some of the taxes on the peasants in the U. P. and Punjab. By the time the three British committees from the R. T. C. reach India (about the end of January), they will find a black situation indeed. I think it will trouble Lord Lothian very deeply, and I think his reports to the Government at home will not be so rosy and complacent as those of the Viceroy and his bureaucratic attendants.

So, for the second time in two years, the elaborate British attempt to win support in India has failed. Each failure has alienated more elements and created more doubt and disillusionment among those of the Indian intelligentsia who are too timid to be strong partisans either way. Now more Indian merchants and industrialists are convinced that they must support the Congress. Some of them are inclined to do this even though they are afraid of a peasant revolt; while others are at least immobilized, torn between hatred of Britain and fear of a social revolution, so that anyhow they will not help Britain. More Moslems, especially among the younger men, are with the Congress and active. The meagreness of the news indicates the strictness of the censorship, and that shows that the movement is very powerful and widespread. It may perhaps also mean that already there have been some big massacres by the troops or police. The foreign press correspondents are only in the big cities and know nothing of what is happening in the country districts. But it is what happens among the peasants that will settle the matter. Undoubtedly the Government is deeply disturbed. Sir Samuel Hoare, Secretary of State for India, said on January 14 in London that so far the Government had maintained "law and order," but that he was "touching wood" when he said it. That betrays considerable nervousness.

The ordinances permit horrible tyranny, but it is clear that they are not being everywhere enforced as severely as their wording allows. The sentences we hear of are not much worse than those of 1930. The ordinances are being defied, according to the reports, and apparently much picketing is going on. All this means that the ferocious wording of the ordinances is partly for bullying and terrifying intent; also that they are probably being enforced capriciously according to the mood of the local officials; also that the authorities realize that it would be exceedingly costly in money to enforce the ordinances rigidly. Capricious tyranny in the long run ensures its own overthrow because the resentment it arouses exceeds any fear it may create, and because of the reactions of foreign public opinion.

The finances of the provincial governments and the central government are in very bad condition, and have been so ever since the middle of 1930. The continuing fall of prices, the boycott and tax refusals will cut down the revenues much further, and the extra police and military expenses will unbalance the Government accounts far more than they are now. Inasmuch as last year the British Government stated that it would guarantee Indian government debts, the British financiers will undoubtedly draw on this promise, thus tending to upset the British budget. So before long the burden will begin to be felt directly by the British taxpayers. The Viceregal ordinances forbidding money gifts to the Congress or to Nationalist activities, and attempting to compel Indian banks to do exactly as the Government orders, will tend to separate Indian banking from British banking, and not only to drive the former underground but to give it self-reliance—a good preparation for Swaraj.

We have seen in the papers about the separate

post office which the Congress is starting. Gandhi wrote me last summer that there were a lot of other plans for the Congress running parallel government functions. One of these will be village courts and councils. This will be excellent practice and will tend to cut down Government authority and prestige. It is true that a complete and real victory will not be attained until Indians attain greater unity and get rid of some social evils, and until the British have a real change of heart. I believe that both these things will happen. But before the British can, as a nation, have such a change, they will have to lose their pride, and probably the actual loss of all their political and economic power in India must come first and provide the reason for such loss of pride.

We are going to see vividly the truth of the saying of the old beggar in D. G. Mukerji's book—"The longer the British stay in India, the sooner they will go." We may naturally shrink from the thought of the sufferings that Indians are undergoing and will undergo. Nevertheless, it is a little like the creative suffering of a woman in childbirth—the result will be worth the cost. For in this instance the result will be not only political and economic freedom for India, but a freer and happier world for us all, including England herself. We owe India a tremendous debt of gratitude already.

RICHARD B. GREGG.

France Plays Her Cards

The conversations in Washington between Hoover and Laval were wrecked upon the simple fact that the United States, though inclined to make a so-called consultative pact with France (a promise to consult together in the case of any state breaking the Kellogg Pact) perhaps even to help in warding off a "proved aggressor," was only prepared to do so with financial and economic means. France stood firm for the military assistance of America, or, at least, for her recognition of what would amount to an "effective" blockade approved by the League of Nations. Hoover declined. The Conference was wrecked.

Wrecked. That means no less than this: no French self-imposed duty to disarm; no extension of the Hoover moratorium over further periods; no agreement about the reduction of reparations and war debts; no French-American agreement for the mitigation of the credit crisis, beginning with Central Europe.

The failure of the Conference has laid bare the fact that France, even in face of the immediate danger of the collapse of the whole world-economic and world-financial system, refuses to relinquish her policy of power, or, to use a milder phrase, her political "security" line.

Everyone knows that France's insatiable thirst for security takes its rise in the Treaty of Versailles. Indeed, the treaty itself was, in some sense, the offspring of this desire for security, which drove Clemenceau so far that he demanded even the Rhine frontier. He did not achieve this aim, but he received instead a promise of alliance from the U. S. A. and England. England redeemed this promise, probably too late, in Locarno. Wilson did not survive having been driven by his people to break his pledge. The last vain effort to make America stand security for the French peace treaties had been the Kellogg Pact—that is, of course, in the form proposed by Briand, in which it would have held simply between France and America.

The latest French campaign which has just failed in Washington to secure the help of America's strong arm in protecting the Versailles treaty begins with the world credit crisis. Between the Austrian Credit-Antalt and the German Danat Bank crises a politically framed "relief plan" for Germany was developed by France, which immediately met with the sharpest American and English refusal. That proposal held in embryo all that followed. In looking back one is driven, in spite of all, to admire the cool French tactics of biding their time.

On June 20 Hoover makes the great gesture of a moratorium, which could have broken the psychological ban of a credit crisis in which all sought, panic-stricken, for some way out. The French Government throws all its weight against the drive of Hoover's relief effort, puts the brake on its progress and, wholly ignoring elementary decencies, succeeds in rendering it ineffective. No easy undertaking. Laval is swimming against the stream, loses prestige, has to admit himself defeated all along the line—but his policy of procrastination succeeds. He can only enter on so risky an undertaking because he already knows that the English financial situation is at breaking point. And so the apparently impossible happens: France, on the morrow of the Hoover moratorium isolated, can now dictate to the rest of the world the conditions under which it may be permitted to help Germany.

These ten days, July 13 to July 23, from the collapse of the Danat Bank to the end of the London Conference, were destiny-laden. The French memorandum dated July 15 said: "No disarmament without added security" (that is, without "implementing" the Kellogg Pact, or America's rapprochement to the League of Nations system). On July 16 came France's famous offer to join England and America in allowing Germany a long term credit of 500 million dollars. This was the already mentioned French Plan, very sharply turned down by the U. S. A. because, besides naturally demanding continuous customs guarantees, it also stated as a condition the well known ten years' "political moratorium" for Germany. An unequalled attempt at a politico-financial stampede! To repel this attack and to help Germany, England called together a conference of the great powers, to meet in London on July 20 at 3 o'clock, and did not wait for France's acceptance. Now, if ever, Paris was threatened with isolation. July 18 saw Brüning in Paris; held in France's golden grip, the German Republic stepped out once more on the road of Franco-German rapprochement. Laval laid down as conditions to the promoters of the conference that in London no political questions —neither disarmament nor security, neither war debts nor reparations—be bound up with credit relief for Germany. France, playing to gain time, feels as yet too weak to allow great decisions to be taken (the pound sterling is still shining with its old glory). Laval arrives in London on time, leading his prisoner Brüning along as a hostage.

Surely seldom has any two days' conference had to meet the full impact of such a world-political hurricane. America and England demand a "stand-still" for

Germany, for which the three creditor powers should stand security. According to a semi-official calculation, America's share of the short term credits for Germany is 60 per cent, England's 35 per cent and France's only 5 per cent. How could France bear to wreck the redemption of civilization by so small a refusal? And if she did dare, would not England and America simply pass over these 5 per cent and carry out, without France, arrangements for a "stand-still," with all the far-reaching consequences that this self-obliteration of one of Germany's main creditors must bring for her? But M. Laval was not to be bluffed. He knew what he was about. Coolly he played his cards. The semi-official report with its complete and quiet irony has the effect of the flashing of cold steel. Is France ready to agree to a "stand-still" as far as her 5 per cent share of German credit goes? "M. Laval answers that he is accustomed only to promise that which he can perform. He openly refers to the fact that he does not know precisely what the claims of French banks in Germany amount to, but he has reason to believe that considerable sums of French money have been lent *indirectly* to Germany by way of the banks of other countries. Laval emphasises the fact that such re-lending carries not only the hope of profit but the danger of loss. It is to be desired that things be left as they are. And in any case the French Government is not in a position to arrange for an extension of French credit without the Government itself standing security for such." (*Temps,* July 23).

That is, in plain English, if America and England should start without (i. e. against) France to arrange a "stand-still" for Germany, then France would call in her American assets. Today we know that the thrust would have been mortal. Its first victim would have been the House of Morgan. A few hours later the London conference had failed.

At the time of the Hoover plan France had been still on the defensive. The struggle had lasted for two weeks until the sabotage was complete. In London the process was much swifter, for meantime the first casualty had occurred, the Danat Bank had closed its doors. But the time was not yet ripe for an offensive. It was enough that the conference was wrecked upon the strength of France's financial position; or rather, on the secret weakness of England's and America's. England was warned. So was America. It was now a mere question of time, and a short time at that, until the isolation of Germany in the political credit situation should take its full effect, first in Germany itself, then in England, then in America. The *Temps* wrote briefly and coolly: "One should not be deceived. In *six months* France, without whose co-operation no effective financial help is possible, will make precisely the same conditions: financial mortgages and political guarantees" (July 25). That may have sounded at the time like sheer audacity, but it was not. Two months later the Bank of England went off the gold standard. And on the same day Hoover invited Laval to a discussion of the "highest importance" in Washington.

The last act opened.

Hoover seems from the beginning to have had little hope of the Washington meeting. Perhaps it was due to Stimson's influence that the invitation was sent at all. Perhaps also Hoover thought that even a failure was good enough to make clear to the American public the necessity of an independent initiative on the question of war debts. Many things lead one to suppose that Stimson imagined it much easier than proved to be the case to meet the French desire for security. Some measure of "rapprochement" between the U. S. A. as protector of the Kellogg Pact and the League of Nations would, he believed, prove sufficient. And so he allowed his representative in Geneva to sit for the first time on the Permanent Disarmament Commission of the League of Nations—which is not simply a special body like the Preparatory Commission. He also took a very important step in allowing Mr. Prentiss Gilbert, as representative of the U. S. A. (in the Manchurian question) to take his place at the council table in order to meet in their capacity as Kellogg Pact powers with the others. Stimson's innocent phrase for these tactics was "American support for the work of the League of Nations"—perhaps France would be content to see in this that "certain promise of effective mutual help in case of an offensive war," which Paris, in the memorandum of July 15, had stated as the imperative condition of "further" reductions in armaments. In principle France was satisfied with a solution along this line. "Co-operation between America and Europe" (so Stimson's move was described in Paris) would change the League of Nations from a powerless center of gossip into a world-wide power armed with its own executive. It is unnecessary to point out how far removed (in spite of agreement on a common line) was Stimson's Areopagus at Geneva (fathered by Kellogg) from the French ideal of a guard-room over the doors of which should be engraved every single paragraph of the Versailles Treaty.

The depth of this misunderstanding was clear from the start in the desperate atmosphere of the Washington negotiations. France will allow no connection between disarmament and debts, but demands such between debts and reparations, and between security and disarmament. America, on the other hand, refuses to connect disarmament and security, debts and reparations, but emphatically asserts a connection between American debt cancellation and French disarmament. France wants no extended moratorium, but only the Young Plan, and nothing else. But America has officially no knowledge of the Young Plan and threatens on the contrary, a moratorium extension of several years. Hoover had intended such since the beginning of October, when he was empowered to found the well known 500 million dollars acceptance bank, though, due to the opposition of a number of senators, this plan for extension was postponed.

The political result of the conference is a lot less than nothing. Laval has blocked one of the few remaining roads to safety open to humanity in the midst of chaos—Franco-American co-operation. And blocked it for the sake of French "security." All the swifter and surer will begin the clearing up of the problem of Germany's foreign commitments. To sound the call of understanding with France in face of this attitude of the leader of French policy has become a tragic duty. Yet certainly the delight shown by German nationalists at the failure in Washington is baseless. For the more blatantly French nationalism, blind behind its blinkers, pursues its policy in persistent opposition to the needs of the world on the brink of collapse, the nearer draws, so one hopes, the inevitable moment when the return of the Anglo-Saxon bloc to world policies will once more give a chance to the forces of international peace.

Vienna, Austria KARL POLANYI.

The Study Table

History by an Historic Figure

I

The second volume of Memoirs of Prince von Bulow* covers the period of 1903-1909, when the great German statesman was the Imperial Chancellor. It contains intimate details of most important events in World Politics—such as the Russo-Japanese War and the Treaty of Portsmouth, Treaty of Bojorke which was concluded between the Kaiser and the Tsar, The Morocco Crisis and the Algeciras Conference, the Anglo-French Entente, the Second Hague Conference, the Anglo-Russian Convention which later developed into the Triple Entente, the Bosnian Crisis, Anglo-German relations or Anglo-German Naval Rivalry as well as other important events. Furthermore, the book supplies interesting details of German internal politics —party politics as well—and its effect on German foreign relations. The author gives vivid descriptions of his dealings with his Imperial Master—Wilhelm II —who often unintentionally created most difficult situations for the Imperial Chancellor charged with the direction of foreign affairs of the state.

In one respect this study is unique, because it not only narrates facts pertaining to German politics and international relations, but gives intimate picture of human relations between statesmen and monarchs of various lands as well as court-intrigues which had disastrous effects in world affairs. This phase of the work may be taken by some readers as less serious and gossipy. But to me it deals with psychological aspects of history as depicted by likes and dislikes of chief characters on the stage of world politics. It is generally ignored by many, that personal element—likes, dislikes and even pre-conceived notions of statesmen —often play a very important part in actual government and international relations. Prince Von Bulow is merciless in uncovering weakness, incompetence and at times lack of patriotism and gross selfishness of highly placed personalities (often German). This phase of the work has aroused violent antagonism among a very large section of German nationalists and German monarchists who are loud in denouncing this work of intrinsic value. Prince Bulow's narration of principal events in international relations has been told in a most entertaining fashion and is accurate. His conclusions are accurate as verifiable works of eminent scholars and memoirs of statesmen.

I

Internal Policies

(a) *The repeal of The Anti-Jesuit Law*

Prince Bulow belonged to the Prussian aristocracy; and at least for three generations the Bulow family served the Prussian kings in high places. Bulow was a disciple of Bismarck and was opposed to socialism. He belonged to the conservatives, but he was not narrow-minded as he advocated co-operation of the conservatives with the liberals, in strengthening the cause of national solidarity. He was a Protestant; but opposed to narrow religious fanaticism of those who fought the Catholics in Germany. In fact one of the first acts of Bulow as the Imperial Chancellor was the repeal of a certain objectionable feature of the anti-Jesuit Law (of July 4, 1871) which provided that "members of the Order (Jesuit) or an affiliated body, might, if of foreign birth be expelled from German territory." He had some difficulty in securing imperial sanction, because the Kaiser who like "most Protestants and even a certain number of Catholics, had a strong prejudice against Jesuits." The Kaiserin and her court circle was anti-Catholic. Bulow was against religious discrimination. The Conservatives opposed Bulow in this matter. The Catholic-Centre Party was grateful to Bulow for this act. However later on the Conservatives and the Catholic-Centre joined forces to bring about his downfall. In this connection it may be noted that the German Conservatives (who now call themselves Nationalists) are not only anti-Catholic, but anti-Semitic. Bulow did not have any prejudice against Jews. At one time he wished to recommend Walter Rathenau to the position of Secretary of Treasury.

> The Kaiser (Wilhelm II) was free from anti-Semitism. But he felt that the appointment of a Jew (in 1908) to what was the very important office of Secretary of the Treasury, would arouse ill feeling in the Right . . . (page 429).

Thus he had to abandon the idea.

(b) *Expropriation of Polish Land*

While advocating liberalism towards the Catholics and Jews, Bulow was unalterably opposed to the Poles. This opposition was due to the fact that he believed Germany should strengthen her position in East Prussia otherwise the Poles would oust the Germans from that region. Bulow not only favored German colonization in Eastern Prussia, but advocated expropriation of property of Polish landlords (absentee) to furnish land for German colonizers. Bulow justified his actions against the Poles on the ground that the security of the state demanded exceptional measures. In defense of this discriminatory measure Bulow held,

> In German Poland the continued existence of the Prussian State and German culture were at stake (p. 12) (Bulow contended), We cannot, by free purchase, satisfy our need for more land, so that therefore, *in the superior interests of the State,* the Commission for Colonization must be authorized to proceed to expropiatory measures (page 550).

This measure was supported by the Conservatives, the Emperor himself (p. 549) but was opposed by the Centre and Liberals and even by some politicians— "men of intellect devoted to the State and in other ways favorable to the Government" (p. 548). Bulow thought that this policy was justifiable on the ground of preservation of State and would have been a great success. But later on, after his retirement the German Government followed a pro-Polish policy which led to the creation of united Poland. It is fate that the Poles are using the same policy against the Germans in Posen and East Prussia, as the Germans did against them. As early as December, 1922, the *Berliner Tageblatt* wrote:

> Seven hundred thousand Germans have been driven out of Posen and West Prussia alone, by the Poles, since they obtained possession of these provinces: an appalling figure, indicative of human tragedy now being played behind the frontiers of the new Poland (p. 548).

I may add that statesmen have not learnt anything from the study of history or the tragedies of the

*"Memoirs of Prince von Bulow," Vol. II. Little, Brown & Co. Boston, 1931, page 626. Price $5.00.

World War. They do not hesitate to sacrifice genuine interests of humanity for the sake of glorification of the State and they treat men as chattels and inflame racial hatred on the pretext of serving the cause of culture and interests of the State. Poland was partitioned by three powerful monarchies of Russia, Austria and Germany. These Empires have passed away, and united and free Poland has arisen. There is every indication that in place of German oppression of the Poles there has arisen the problem of Polish oppression of Germans and world peace is threatened by the "Polish Corridor Question" which is one of the contributions of the Treaty of Versailles—so unjust to the German people.

(c) *Tariff and Protection of Agriculture*

Bulow was interested in German national prosperity and security. He was not satisfied with the mere growth of German industry and commerce. He felt that German agriculture should be protected and German industrialization should not be aided at the cost of German agriculture. In this he was successful and was aided by the Conservatives and others. Needless to say that Bulow thought of checking the spread of discontent among the rural population and thus thwart the march of socialism. In this he was successful, because of national prosperity and rising standards of living among the German workers who were better protected by laws than was the case with the British workers. Bulow felt gratified that in the general election of 1907 the socialists suffered a serious defeat and their number in the Reichstag was reduced considerably.

(d) *Fiscal Reform*

Bulow felt the urgent necessity of bringing about such financial reform as would strengthen the economic position of the Government of the Empire. This was a necessity for the sake of pursuing a constructive policy in respect to national defense (naval construction and military expenditure) and also to strengthen German position in international relations. A state militarily and navally weak cannot pursue a vigorous foreign policy, and without financial stability a state cannot have a strong army and navy. The Kaiser, the Conservatives in general, as well as the National-Liberals and others were for financial reform, as a desired idea. But when Bulow insisted that a moderate "Death Duty" or inheritance tax should be imposed, to raise several millions of marks annually, he was met with serious opposition from the Conservatives, supported by the Agrarian League (p. 516). Bulow felt that Death Duty was a just form of taxation which falls more heavily on the rich who can bear the burden of taxation. This roused the German aristocracy against Bulow's proposal. Bulow found them to be opposed to any "electoral reform" (reform of the three class voting system) in Prussia. Bulow was supported by the National Liberals who saw a moderate "Death Duty" was a necessity. The Socialists were naturally in favor of such a measure, but did not take the side of Bulow and refrained from voting. The Poles who wished to punish Bulow for the Expropriation Law extended their aid to the Conservatives and even the Catholic Centre which in the past advocated such a measure changed its attitude, made a common cause with the Conservatives purely for political reasons of gaining greater power in the Reichstag. "The Death Duties were rejected by 195 to 187 votes." This was one of the immediate causes of the retirement of Prince von Bulow from the position of Imperial Chancellorship.

(e) *The Daily Telegraph Incident*

One of the most important events which had great significance in internal and international politics of Germany was the *Daily Telegraph* incident. Kaiser Wilhelm II was most anxious to give publicity to his views on International relations of Germany, *with the intention of improving Anglo-German relations.* He gave an interview to a special correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* to be published in England. The Kaiser sent a copy of the article containing the interview to Prince Bulow for his perusal and comment. The Imperial Chancellor was at that time much occupied with the Bosnian crisis and Tariff Reform and sent the manuscripts to the permanent high officials of the Foreign Office to be looked over and to report to him. Prince Bulow was not at all aware of the contents of the article. The Foreign Office officials, to avoid the displeasure of the Kaiser, did not make any change in the contents of the article which was full of indiscreet statements. Technically Bulow was responsible for the publication of the article, as he did not raise any objection. But the real blame was on the shoulders of the Kaiser and the officials of the Foreign Office.

This article created a most unfavorable impression in Germany and abroad and seriously impaired German foreign relations. It contained four very serious assertions on the part of the Kaiser Wilhelm: (1) The Kaiser Wilhelm was possibly the only German who was sincerely friendly to Great Britain. (2) The German Navy was not built against Britain, but to cooperate with Britain in the Far East against Japan. (3) During the Boer War the French and the Russian Governments asked Germany to join them in a move against Britain, but the German Government refused to join them. (4) During the Boer War, the sympathy of the Kaiser was with the English and he sent a plan of operation against the Boers to his grandmother, Queen Victoria. Lord Robert's plan of action against the Boers coincided with that of his own (p. 501). The net result of the interview was to create a most unfavorable impression against Germany in Great Britain, France, Russia and Japan (p. 415-416).

For Bulow there were two alternatives—to tell the whole truth or to bear the responsibility and defend the Kaiser as best as possible. He followed the second alternative. The Conservative Party made a very bitter attack against the Kaiser, both in the Reichstag and in their party-organs. The result of an unfavorable agitation against the Kaiser led to his nervous breakdown; and on one occasion he thought of abdicating in favor of the Crown Prince (pp. 430-431). But Bulow opposed any such move.

In the Reichstag Prince Bulow defended the Kaiser; while the Conservatives as well as members of the Center Party demanded an assurance that in future there would be no such lack of discretion on the part of the Emperor. It virtually amounted to a demand for ministerial responsibility. Bulow gave such an assurance in an indirect way which was hailed as satisfactory (p. 411). The *Daily Telegraph* incident wounded the vanity of Kaiser Wilhelm II. The self-seeking courtiers who called themselves members of

the "League of the Loyalists" spread the impression that Prince von Bulow did not defend the Kaiser as he should have done. They poisoned the mind of the Kaiser even to the extent that Bulow was disloyal to the monarchy and wished to establish a republic with the idea of becoming its president after deposing Kaiser Wilhelm II (pp. 504-505). This court intrigue and the growing displeasure of the Kaiser to His Imperial Chancellor was the real cause of Bulow's fall in 1909.

Bulow left the office with a heavy heart. He feared that mishandling of German Foreign Policy would lead to a World War which might wreck the German Empire and demolish the monarchy.

TARAKNATH DAS.

[*To be concluded next week*]

Correspondence

C. M. T. C.

Editor of UNITY:

Readers of UNITY will want to know of the very heated controversy now centering in Washington over the reduction of our War Department budget. Faced with the absolute necessity to economize in our federal expenditures, a number of Congressional leaders see that the army and the navy, constituting two of our largest financial outlays, offer the greatest possibilities for reductions. They are accordingly trying to squeeze out of the Army bill, now under consideration by the appropriation committee, some of the unnecessary, extravagant, and worthless items that have crept into that budget during the prosperous years when the treasury was continually getting more revenue than the estimates predicted, and the taxpayers smiled upon $700,000,000 "throwaways."

I shall illustrate the point with two of the proposals—dropping the Citizens' Military Training Camps and curtailing the Reserve Officers Training Corps in schools and colleges.

Set up under the National Defense Act as a means of training Reserve Officers, these camps have enrolled in the past ten years 223,198 cadets, of whom only 15,838 have graduated from the blue course. Of these only 3,054 have accepted Reserve Commissions and only 1,807 now retain these commissions. Furthermore, the number accepting commissions has declined from 813 in 1924 to 85 in 1931. This last year 53 camps enrolled 38,546 cadets under 11,051 military tutors (4,441 officers and 6,610 men) at an outlay of $2,814,772 directly appropriated for the camps, plus the pay of the army personnel and free issues of equipment. All this produced 85 Reserve Officers.

Their military futility has progressed to the point that Major General Charles P. Summerall, when Chief of Staff of the United States Army, declared that, ". . . it is apparent that the camps do not directly serve to promote any military objective." Their value lay in the "goodwill" they created among civilians for the army, he maintained.

The civilian advocates of the camps are made up of three groups: (a) boys and parents who see in them free vacations; (b) certain "patriotic" organizations who want all boys to be taught a military brand of "citizenship"; (c) other persons who still hold the idea that military officers and military training possess some peculiar magic not possessed by civil teachers and civil schools and camps for making "good citizens." These advocates have frankly promoted the camps for non-military objectives, and have admitted they were of little military value.

But the National Defense Act does not permit the War Department to operate these camps for any purpose but the specific one of training reserve officers. Moreover, American educational tradition and practice do not allow the federal government to invade the field of general education. The War Department has ignored these two limitations in both the C. M. T. C. and in military training in schools and colleges, and has set up its own educational course, manned by its own instructors—an educational practice not heretofore tolerated by any other federal agency.

Last year 147,009 cadets took military training under 1,771 army instructors in 313 colleges, city high school systems and other secondary schools, at a cost of some $10,000,000 or $11,000,000—to secure only 5,985 Reserve Officers. Half of these will promptly drop all interest in their commissions, if they are like former graduates of the R. O. T. C.

The best minds in the War Department and in Congress see that the summer camps and military training in high schools should be completely abandoned, and that the college courses should be made elective so that some 40,000 unwilling draftees, who will never become Reserve Officers, may be removed from federal expense.

This program will go through unless those who insist upon Uncle Sam doling out free vacations and parade uniforms to boys and girls in schools and colleges overpower the better judgment of both our military and Congressional leaders. For some days there will rage the battle of telegrams and letters "from home." Readers of UNITY will want to do their bit to help patriotic Congressmen and Senators reduce our public expenditures to the barest necessities, that every dollar may be turned into constructive channels for relieving the depression.

TUCKER P. SMITH
Secretary, Committee on Militarism in Education

New York City, N. Y.

The Aggressor in War

Editor of UNITY:

Ever since the signing of the "Peace Pact," there has been a great amount of argument as to how to determine the aggressor in case of war.

The trouble is we have thought so long in terms of war, we cannot get away from it. Under the war system the aggressor was as hard to find as the Irishman's flea, when you put your finger on him he was not there. But since the signing of the "Pact" he has been brought out into the open in plain sight of everyone.

If we will strip the Articles of the "Pact" down to the bone or skeleton, I think you will see what I mean. In Article One "they condemn and renounce war." In Article Two is where the aggressor is defined in unmistakable language: "The settlement of all disputes of whatever nature, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

Now, who is the aggressor? The one that strikes the first blow. It makes no difference whether he is in the right or wrong, whether his cause is just or unjust. He signed he would never have recourse to war. His very act of signing makes him the aggressor if he strikes the first blow.

JOHN T. RICKETT

Howell, Mich.

Buying Loyalty

Editor of UNITY:

The Viceroy of India, we are told, has just promised "certain persons" pensions for life, if they will continue loyal to the British government, and also half pensions to their children, for life. As things are now going, is it not somewhat rash for the Viceroy to assume that the British government will be able to dispose of the tax-money paid by the people of India for two generations to come?

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL

Boston, Mass.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 362)

all, such friction as was experienced in producing the United Church of Canada must be avoided.

Beside the economic reason for this union, there is the religious need for plowing a deep channel of liberalism with each group acting as a true complement. Both groups have developed individualism; together they can develop a missionary policy of greater power. The quality of each group has been high, and together the advantage of quantity can be achieved.

At the Tuesday evening meeting Dr. Charles E. Snyder of Davenport,

Iowa, spoke on "Credits and Values." He described life as a process just as energy is a process. In this process, he said, experience and choice (since we enjoy free will) present a body of material which we evaluate. It is from this evaluation that we develop our ultimate goals in life, and today they are social and not theological goals. In a crisis, the counterfeit nature or the true nature of our evaluation is discovered, and bankruptcy or happiness, which is the by-product of life's achievements, follows. Our spiritual leaders today guide in this true evaluation and therefore assist the individual in averting spiritual bankruptcy.

Rev. William Robert Hodgson of the Congregationalist Church at Moline, Illinois, addressed the conference on "Safe-guarding Our Youth." Youth, Mr. Hodgson said, rebels at institutional religion and yet the psychologists claim that faith is helpful if not essential. We want honest intellectualism combined with whatever is helpful in meeting the crises of life. Consequently, the church must express the ideals of youth if it would win the young people over. In order to develop the old fire and spirit in the *new* issues, youth needs the background of sacred literature, the appeal to imagination in ceremonies, and exercises, and the church serving as a rallying ground and power house for ultimate goals.

At the Wednesday afternoon round table, Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Dean of Abraham Lincoln Center of Chicago, opened the discussion on "Race Conflicts" with a statement of causes of conflict. He gave examples of conflict caused by differences in language, in ordinary customs of daily life, in imperialistic purposes, in religion, in economic structures, in whatever inherited racial prejudices there might be. Dr. Reese does not believe that doing away with the causes of conflict is as important as setting up some social machine by which conflict may be dealt with sympathetically and thoroughly when it occurs.

At the meeting of the Council Wednesday morning, it was voted that Dr. Louis L. Mann of Sinai Congregation, Chicago, assume the place of Dr. Tobias Schanfarber on the Executive Committee, the other members of that Committee to be Dr. Charles E. Snyder, Executive Chairman, Dr. L. Ward Brigham, Judge Roger S. Galer, and Dr. Curtis W. Reese. Because of increasing duties in his law practice entailing a growing demand upon his time and strength in this period of business distress in the territory which his law office serves, Mr. Roger S. Galer asked to be excused from the office of president of the Federation in which he has served for five years, and Dr. L. Ward Brigham of St. Paul's on the Midway, Chicago, was elected to succeed him. Mr. Galer remains on the Executive Committee, however, and he will continue his active interest in the Federation and its efforts at the closer understanding and relationships among the liberal religious movements.

Dr. Reese presented a resolution, which was approved and accepted:

"Whereas, the National Federation of Religious Liberals has suffered irreparable loss in the passing of Dr. Charles W. Wendte, pastor, author, co-founder of the National Federation and the International Congress, and spiritual leader of the wider fellowship;

"And whereas, we greatly miss his wise counsel, cautious judgments, adventuresome religious idealism;

"Therefore, Be It Resolved that we spread upon the records of the Federation this expression of our sorrow over his passing, our joy over his triumphant life."

The appointments to the Council and election of Members-at-Large and Honorary Vice-President were made, effective until the annual meeting of 1935. The Universalist General Convention reappointed Dr. L. W. Brigham of Chicago and Judge Roger S. Galer of Mt. Pleasant. The Central Conference of American Rabbis appointed Dr. Louis L. Mann of Chicago, and Dr. Barnet Brickner of Cleveland, Ohio. Dr. Charles E. Snyder of Davenport, Iowa, and the Rev. Ernest Caldecott of Schenectady, New York, were appointed by the American Unitarian Association. Mr. J. Barnard Walton represents the General Conference of the Religious Society of Friends. The Members-at-Large will be:

Frank B. Adams, Detroit, Mich.; Horace F. Bridges, Chicago; Frank H. Burt, Boston, Mass.; Harry L. Canfield, Greensboro, N. C.; Percival Chubb, St. Louis, Mo.; A. J. DeJarnette, Soddy, Tenn.; William Robert Hodgson, Moline, Ill.; Felix Levy, Chicago, Ill.; Walter H. Macpherson, Joliet, Ill.; Eugene Mannheimer, Des Moines, Iowa; Alfred W. Martin, New York, N. Y.; John F. Meyer, Columbus, Ohio; Curtis W. Reese, Chicago, Ill.; Sidney B. Snow, Chicago; John van Schaick, Jr., Boston, Mass.

The Honorary Vice-Presidents will be: W. Waldemar W. Argow, Syracuse, N. Y.; Charles Parker Connolly, Rockford, Ill.; Louis C. Cornish, Boston, Mass.; Hugo G. Eisenlohr, Cincinnati, Ohio; Samuel A. Eliot, Boston, Mass.; Roger F. Etz, Boston, Mass.; Percy F. Gardner, Providence, R. I.; Mrs. Max Grief, Baltimore, Md.; Samuel H. Goldenson, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Robert W. Hill, Salem, Mass.; Jesse H. Holmes, Swarthmore, Pa.; Mrs. William Kent, Kentlands, Calif.; Julius Kespohl, Quincy, Ill.; Mrs. Caroline Kleinstuck, Kalamazoo, Mich.; Lee S. McCollester, Tufts College, Mass.; Lucia Ames Mead, Brookline, Mass.; Clinton Lee Scott, Peoria, Ill.; Franklin C. Southworth, Little Compton, R. I.; Frank S. C. Wicks, Indianapolis, Ind.

Frederick Starr Comes East

On February 1st, Dr. Starr started from Seattle on a lecture trip. He will speak at the Abraham Lincoln Centre Friday Morning Forum, on March 4th at 10:30 a. m. His subject will be "What Does the Awakening of the Orient Mean to Us?"

Admission, fifty cents.

Phone Oakland 0489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE AT JOHNSON'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The

Oakland :: Press

GOOD PRINTING

Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.

3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.

PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

A New Volume of

The New Humanist

begins with the

January-February Issue

containing

A Meditation on Modernism

by A. Eustace Haydon

Parrington: A Liberal of the Northwest

by Alexander P. Cappon

Tragedy, and the Mystery of Nature

by F. S. Stowell

A Sketch of Gandhi

by Sureth C. Banerji

Discussions and Book Reviews

by Henry Nelson Wieman, Robert J. Hutcheon, Radislov A. Tasanoff, Eldred C. Vanderlaan, Hugh S. Tigner, James Horton, Walter Kahoe, Harold Buschman.

Subscription, One Dollar

Single Copy, Twenty Cents

THE NEW HUMANIST

14 West First Street

DAYTON, OHIO